

**From:** Adam Loutzenhiser  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 11/16/01 10:59pm  
**Subject:** Microsoft is a shameless monopoly

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

Hash: SHA1

Microsoft should have no right to exist under current law because of their anticompetitive practices. Although there are many examples of Microsoft's stealing intellectual property from other companies and individuals, such as their TCP/IP stack, one practice stands out in my mind: Microsoft prevents computer manufacturers from allowing a computer with a Microsoft operating system from alternatively booting into a non-Microsoft operating system. This is quintessentially anti-competitive, because it effectively prevents other operating systems than Windows from getting mass market exposure.

Most computer users use whatever software is packaged with their systems usually because it's beyond their ability to install other software. This is especially true of operating systems. Although an operating system such as Linux, for example, can be just as user-friendly or even more user-friendly depending on the end user, the installation process often requires technical knowledge that most users don't have. Although there exist computer shops that will install operating systems, most users, not being able to justify spending money for an extra operating system, simply use what is packaged with their computer.

Because of the preexisting popularity of Microsoft operating systems, computer manufacturer's can't simply not install a Microsoft operating system. The simple act of installing a Microsoft operating system prevents them from installing a non-Microsoft operating system on that computer for the customer because of contracts computer manufacturers must sign before they may install any Microsoft operating system. If it weren't for these anti-competitive contracts, most computer manufacturers would probably install a Linux-based operating system in addition to a Microsoft operating system, giving end users exposure to alternative operating systems. Without the anti-competition contracts, end users would have a choice which operating system they use, instead of being forced to use Microsoft's products.

Recently, a memo has been "leaked" by Microsoft, naming Linux as "THE" competition. Therein it was stressed that Linux has a very good chance of displacing Microsoft in both the server and desktop markets. However, nothing could be farther from the truth, because Microsoft has created anti-competition contracts with computer manufacturers. In fact, the memo itself is dubious, because Microsoft's goal would be to prove that it indeed has competition in order to insure it's survival as a monopoly. Whereas a memo such as that can be easily fabricated and "leaked," as Microsoft would have us believe it was, anti-competition contracts are undeniable. When the two tell different stories, it is logical to trust that the factual and

undeniable anti-competition contracts tell a better story of where Microsoft sits as a shameless monopoly.

--

Adam Loutzenhiser, loutzena@student.gvsu.edu, <http://velex.0catch.com/>

AIM: v313x, Yahoo: v313x

"Everyone falls the first time. If you never know failure, how can you know success?"

-- Morpheus, The Matrix

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: GnuPG v1.0.6 (GNU/Linux)

Comment: For info see <http://www.gnupg.org>

iD8DBQE79eC8FDcZZpveFKoRAhN3AJ9nDwAxrUtmsEHo73kb09XziTXS8wCgqk+/  
x7n8cON4ZetrLbGQ5b6hUx0=  
=Ao8+

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----